

**Remarks**

Claims 1-32 are pending in the application. Claims 1-32 are rejected. Amendments to the application are shown above. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-3, 6-7, 10-15, 17-21, 23-25, 27-28, and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega (U.S. 6,564,213) in view of Gilfillan (U.S. 2002/0165856). Claims 4 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega and Gilfillan in view of Bowman (U.S. 6,006,225). Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega and Gilfillan in view of Nye (U.S. 2002/0156917). Claims 5, 22, 26 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega and Gilfillan in view of Chan (U.S. 2006/0129915).

Claim 1 as presently amended expressly recites (emphasis added):

A method of incrementally refining queries and updating query results without requiring a user to provide an explicit indicator of query submission, comprising:

- a) defining one or more query related character patterns that do not include an explicit indicator of query submission;
- b) monitoring entry of query defining characters by a user to detect entry of a defined query related character pattern;
- c) providing the user with one or more suggested query refinement options each time a defined query related character pattern is detected without requiring the user to provide the explicit indicator of query submission; and
- d) providing the user with an updated query result each time a defined query related character pattern is detected without requiring the user to provide the explicit indicator of query submission.

Reply to Office Action mailed July 25, 2006

Application Number: 10/749,936

Attorney Docket Number: 306397.01

The Applicant submits no new matter has been added; the Examiner's attention is directed to at least page 7, lines 26–29, and page 8, lines 8–12, of the specification as originally filed.

On page 3 of the instant Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that Ortega fails to teach "providing the user with an updated query result each time a defined query related character pattern is detected" as recited in Applicant's claim 1. The Examiner cites Gilfillan as disclosing this claim limitation.

Gilfillan is directed to collaborative research systems. A search may be performed on one more selected sources (Figure 5, block 506; [0050, first sentence]). Once the search results have been obtained, the search results may be previewed (Figure 5, block 508; [0055–0056]). A user may refine the search, such as by revising search terms, and perform another search (Figure 5; [0060]). It is noted that the logic of Figure 5 returns to block 506 from block 510 to perform another search. However, Gilfillan fails to disclose that the refined search results are presented without the user explicitly requesting another search. An example of explicitly requesting another search may include hitting an "Enter" key on a keyboard.

Thus, Gilfillan fails to disclose or suggest "providing the user with an updated query result each time a defined query related character pattern is detected without requiring the user to provide the explicit indicator of query submission" as expressly claimed by the Applicant.

Thus, Ortega and Gilfillan, whether taken singularly or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least one of the expressly recited limitations of claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the cited references. Claims 2–12 are dependent claims and distinguish for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1 in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the instant § 103 rejections to claim 1–12 be withdrawn.

Claim 13 as presently amended expressly recites (emphasis added):

“providing the user with an updated query result each time entry of a query defining word is detected without requiring the user to provide the explicit indicator of query submission.”

Independent claim 13 distinguishes from the cited references for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 14–20 are dependent claims and distinguish for at least the same reasons as independent claim 13 in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the instant § 103 rejections to claims 13–20 be withdrawn.

Claim 21 as presently amended expressly recites (emphasis added):

“providing the user with a query result list each time a query defining word is detected without requiring the user to provide the explicit indicator of query submission.”

Independent claim 21 distinguishes from the cited references for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 22–24 are dependent claims and distinguish for at least the same reasons as independent claim 21 in addition to adding further limitations

of their own. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the instant § 103 rejections to claims 21–24 be withdrawn.

Claim 25 as presently amended expressly recites (emphasis added):

“a query result list that is incrementally updated as a query is entered into the query entry text box without requiring the user to provide the explicit indicator of query submission.”

Independent claim 25 distinguishes from the cited references for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 26–29 are dependent claims and distinguish for at least the same reasons as independent claim 25 in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the instant § 103 rejections to claims 25–29 be withdrawn.

Claim 30 as presently amended expressly recites (emphasis added):

“searching the data content and providing the user with an updated query result when a defined query related character pattern is detected without requiring the user to provide the explicit indicator of query submission.”

Independent claim 30 distinguishes from the cited references for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 31–32 are dependent claims and distinguish for at least the same reasons as independent claim 30 in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the instant § 103 rejections to claims 30–32 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Reply to Office Action mailed July 25, 2006  
Application Number: 10/749,936  
Attorney Docket Number: 306397.01

PATENT

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed payment, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Date: October 25, 2006

By: 

Anthony H. Azure, Reg. No.: 52,580

Attorney for Applicant

Direct telephone (425) 707-0399

Microsoft Corporation

One Microsoft Way

Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION  
(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

October 25, 2006  
Date

  
Signature

Kate Marochkina  
Printed Name

Reply to Office Action mailed July 25, 2006

Application Number: 10/749,936

Attorney Docket Number: 306397.01